

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

1-20-2015

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, January 20, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, January 20, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 455.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/455

This Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 20, 2015

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Doug Jackson-Smith
Approval of Minutes December 8, 2014
- 3:05 Announcements**.....Doug Jackson-Smith
1. Update on Senate PTR Working Group Recommendations.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 3:10 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. Electronic P&T Binders Presentation to Senate (already presented to FSEC).....Larry Smith
- 3:25 Reports**
1. EPC Items for January.....Larry Smith
- 3:35 Unfinished Business**
1. AFT code change proposals from PRPC (First Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
2. Other 405 section code change proposals from PRPC (First reading)Stephen Bialkowski
- 4:10 New Business**
1. 405.2.2 (etc.) Code change: Teaching Role Description for P&T.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 4:30 Adjournment**



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 8, 2014 3:00 P.M.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Doug Jackson-Smith (Chair), Dan Davis, Jake Gunther, Mark McLellan (excused), Dan Murphy, Bob Mueller, Jeanette Norton, Jason Olsen, Michael Pace, Robert Schmidt, Charles Waugh, Vincent Wickwar (excused) sub Stephan Bialkowski, Ronda Callister (President Elect), Yanghee Kim (Past President), President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Provost Noelle Cockett (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Atkinson (Assistant) **Guests:** Larry Smith, John Louviere, Francine Johnson, Taya Flores, John Stevens

Doug Jackson-Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

There were no corrections to the minutes. The minutes of November 17, 2014 were adopted.

Announcements

The next Faculty Senate Meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2015.

Extra Service Compensation policy update since the presentation Mark McLellan gave at the December 1st Senate meeting. Senate gave feedback at that meeting and the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee has also given their feedback. Doug is drafting a memo to Mark saying we support the policy though we have some concerns about implementation which he has shared with Mark. An update, as to where the policy is in the procedural process, will be given at the next Senate meeting.

FS President Compensation guidelines have been written and codified and will include a written Memo of Understanding.

University Business - President Albrecht and Provost Cockett.

President Albrecht initiated a conversation on the Faculty Forum Minutes being made public by posting them on the web. He feels that it changes the tone of the conversation if the minutes are available to the press and public. Sydney Petersen felt that minutes of Forums are not necessary and should not be made public, even if they are anonymized. Doug Jackson-Smith agreed to revisit the issue of posting the Forum minutes, and will take steps to ensure that they are completely anonymized. Charles Waugh felt that the minutes were an important source of information for faculty, particularly those who cannot attend, and we should maintain the practice of writing anonymized minutes. Robert Schmidt brought it to the Presidents attention that a full page advertisement for a gun sale which had run in the Statesmen prior to Black Friday.

Provost Cockett informed the Executive Committee that the Global Academy will be discontinued. It was offered through the Office of Global Engagement to aid in recruitment of international students. Of the 650 students who have participated in the Academy since 2010, only 17 have registered for classes.

Former employees of USU will have their @usu.edu email discontinued as of January 15, 2015. Future separations will be discontinued after 30 days. People may choose to use aggieemail.usu.edu or emeriti.usu.edu, but they will have to request this.

Beginning in the 2015 Fall Semester, the USU Common Hour will be discontinued. A campus wide survey of students, faculty, and administrators confirmed that the time was not being used for the purpose intended and was eliminating access for the scheduling of many needed sections of bottleneck courses, i.e. English 1010 and 2010 and Math 0900 – 1050.

Ronda Callister moved to put the Common Hour discontinuance on the January senate agenda as an information item. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Information Items

Update on Electronic P&T Binders – Larry Smith. Software development and testing of the Equella System for electronically formatting P&T Binders began last summer. The biggest complaint they are hearing from faculty about the new system is, “Why didn’t we do this sooner?” There is no change to policy or procedure, and the materials to be included in P&T binders remains the same. However, the material will be submitted through an online portal once this system is implemented (hopefully July 1, 2015). The faculty member builds their dossier, and then their responsibility for it ends. Each college will provide staff to be trained and move the faculty dossier through the review process.

Ronda Callister moved to place this on the February agenda as a presentation. Dan Murphy seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Reports

EPC Items - Larry Smith. The Curriculum Sub-committee addressed 90 course actions. The Academic Standards Committee approved three changes to the general catalogue language in the following areas; Records Hold Policy, Grading Policy, and the Academic Standing Policy. The General Education Sub-committee reported a course and syllabi discussion. We should expect more R401 forms for January.

A motion to place the EPC monthly report on the January reports agenda was made by Robert Schmidt and seconded by Ronda Callister. The motion passed unanimously.

Council on Teacher Education – Francine Johnson. In the past year the Council has approved two new programs, a Business Education Degree for Regional and Distance programs only, and a TEAL Literacy Teaching minor endorsement for K-12. Most of the changes occurred to assist students in passing the PRAXIS exam. This report reflects a decrease in the number of students admitted, due to the 2 year cohort program.

Yanghee Kim made a motion to place this item on the January reports agenda, and Jeanette Norton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Scholarship Advisory Board – Taya Flores. The report is presented in a new format this year to make it more user-friendly. Scholarship numbers are broken down by funding type rather than by funding source.

A motion was made to place this item on the January reports agenda and Ronda Callister seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Unfinished Business

Code Change 402.12.3 Committee on Committees Term (second reading) – Stephan Bialkowski

Motion to place on the January senate agenda as Unfinished Business for the second reading was made by Stephan Bialkowski and seconded by Ronda Callister. The motion passed unanimously.

PTR Working Group Recommendations – Doug Jackson-Smith. The working group has met three times and provided a report and made recommendations for an omnibus package to be presented as a single alternative and highlight the area for choices to be made. Overall there were more areas of agreement than disagreement among the work group members, the differences mainly being finding the best way to a common end. They would like to make a presentation in the next FS meeting to review the elements of their proposal, make any minor changes to it that arise from the discussion and conduct an up or down vote on the overall package. It is important to come to some closure on this issue in the January meeting in order to give PRPC adequate time to write code and vote on it this academic year. The working groups recommendations are: Annual review with a 5-year rolling window review of the PTR standard, Peer Review Committee (PRC) to be invoked only when departments decide this standard has not been met, PRC to be formed by mutual agreement with the department head and faculty member, Professional Development Plans will only be initiated when the PRC concurs with the department’s recommendation, and faculty have the option to invoke a peer review committee once every 5 years.

Stephen Bialkowski asked if these recommendations meet the regents and accreditation body requirements and Doug indicated that the working group feels that they do, in both the spirit and the letter of the requirements.

A motion to place this on the agenda was made by Stephan Bialkowski and seconded by Bob Mueller. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

AFT code change proposals (send to PRPC) – John Stevens. This proposal was initiated by the AFT committee. Two changes correct minor errors and clarifications. The more substantive change would require that in instances of non-renewal, the President's letter clarify which of the three approved reasons for non-renewal applies.

A motion to place this item on the January agenda as new business was made by Stephan Bialkowski and seconded by Jake Gunther. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

Yanghee Kim asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by: Joan Kleinke, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary, 797-1776

FINAL APPROVED PROPOSAL
Proposed Post-Tenure Review (PTR) System Changes
January 12, 2015

The Faculty Senate voted today (42-3) to ask the PRPC to draft code to revise section 405 of faculty code to implement a revised approach to post-tenure review at Utah State University.

Rather than write out proposed code changes, the faculty senate has identified the key features of a new system that they would like, and asks the PRPC to draft code consistent with these features for formal consideration by the faculty senate later this spring.

Overview:

The proposed PTR system that has support from nearly all voting members of the faculty senate would integrate the PTR process with the annual review process for all faculty members who have received tenure. The key elements of the proposed system would be:

- **The annual review process will be the basis for ongoing feedback for tenured faculty, and will serve as the trigger for formation of a peer review committee when a department determines that a faculty member has not met the formal PTR standard.**
 - It should be noted that we are NOT changing any of the ‘critieria’ language in code for either the annual review process or the PTR evaluation.
- **The annual review process will need to be altered/expanded for faculty after they receive tenure.** These changes will include the following features:
 - **Adoption of a 5-year rolling window** for departmental annual reviews for all post-tenure faculty beginning in the year after tenure is awarded.
 - The post-tenure annual review should still include traditional annual performance evaluations (as per current code), should provide faculty with meaningful feedback on their performance, and can serve as the basis for merit pay decisions.
 - **Specification that in the year after the tenure decision, the departmental annual review process be expanded to also include formal assessment of whether a faculty member is meeting the PTR standard.**
 - **In the event that the departmental annual review process (with multi-year window) determines that the faculty member is NOT meeting the PTR standard, a Peer Review Committee should be formed.**
 - Code should describe procedures for the formation of a Peer Review Committee (PRC).
- **The Professional Development Plan (PDP) section of code needs to be changed to specify that a PDP can only be initiated at instigation of a Peer Review Committee.**

WORKING GROUP PROPOSAL SUMMARY

CURRENT PROCESS	PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE
Post-Tenure Review	
A. <u>Initiated automatically</u> every 5 years	A. <u>Triggered</u> by negative annual review with multi-year window
	A1. Can be initiated no earlier than 5 years past tenure or post-tenure promotion decision year.
	A2. Could optionally be requested by faculty once every 5 years (post-tenure or promotion decision)
	A3. Requires a warning letter from department be sent to faculty member 1 year before formal trigger can be initiated.
B. Peer Committee formed by DH <u>in consultation with</u> candidate	B. Peer Committee formed by <u>mutual agreement</u> of DH and candidate
C. Assesses 5 year performance	C. Assesses rolling 5 year performance
D. Results in letter	D. Results in letter; if negative – initiates Professional Development Plan (PDP)
Annual Review Process	
E. Done by department	E. Done by department
F. Typically single year, can be multi-year review	F. Post-tenure, always a <u>multi-window to each annual review</u>
	F1. Based on 5-year rolling window
G. Used for annual feedback	G. Still used for annual feedback
H. Used for merit pay	H. Still used to inform merit pay decisions
I. <u>Used to trigger Professional Devt Plan</u> ; PDP initiated at discretion of Dept. Head	I. Negative MYAR used to <u>trigger Peer Review Committee</u> (if department determines basic performance standard not met)
Professional Development Plans (PDPs)	
J. Regular feedback through annual review process (less formal than PDP)	J. Regular feedback through annual review process (less formal than PDP)
K. <u>PDP initiated by Department Head</u> (without any peer review process)	K. <u>PDP only initiated by Peer Review Committee via confirmation of negative MYAR</u> ; Department role = trigger Peer Review Committee (not PDP directly)

WORKING GROUP PROPOSAL DETAILS

As background, the following details were included in the description of the proposal that was the basis for the faculty senate vote on January 12, 2015, with some minor word editing to change tense, eliminate ‘we recommend’ phrases, and adapt to changes voted on by the faculty at the recent meeting (noted in red).

1. **Form the PTR Peer Review Committee (PRC) by ‘mutual agreement’ of the faculty member and department head** (in place of current code which only requires consultation with the faculty member)
 - The faculty eligible to serve on the PRC should parallel language presently in code.
 - The procedures for selecting people to serve on a particular PRC should be modified to require ‘mutual agreement’ of the faculty member and department head (it presently calls only for ‘consultation’).
 - An appeals procedure should be outlined to ensure a PRC can be formed if the faculty member and DH cannot agree on a fair and balanced membership for the PRC.
2. **Have the multi-year annual review (MYAR) serve as the core of a post-tenure review system** (e.g., provide feedback on performance on an annual basis, but looking at a multi-year window).
 - The MYAR process should serve as an important (though less formal) mechanism to provide post-tenure faculty with advice, mentoring, and feedback regarding areas of strength and weakness and strategies to improve performance.
3. **Have the full peer review committee engage in a post tenure review only when ‘triggered’** (rather than automatically occur every 5 years)
4. **Have a formal negative MYAR be the ‘trigger’ for forming a Peer Review Committee.**
The criteria for a formal negative MYAR would be defined by language currently in 405.12.2:
 - “The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement.”
 - One obvious option is to specify that the annual review letter for all post-tenure faculty must include a statement that the faculty member IS or IS NOT “discharging conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement.”
5. **Use a 5-year window for the MYAR**
 - The task for recommended, and FS concurred by majority vote at the 1/12/15 meeting that a 5 year window should be used.
6. **Use the MYAR as a replacement for the current annual review for post-tenure faculty**
 - We should not have two separate AR letters (one based on a single year for merit pay, and another based on a multi-year window for PTR purposes). The MYAR should serve the role that annual review letters currently play (both to provide annual feedback on performance but also as the basis for merit pay decisions).
7. **Start using the multi-year window for post-tenure annual reviews in the year following the tenure or post-tenure promotion decision.**

8. **Timing on when a negative MYAR decision be issued and the Peer Review Committee invoked:**
 - A negative MYAR decision and creation of a PRC cannot take place until 5 years following the date when either tenure or post-tenure promotion are awarded.
 - **At the meeting on January 12, FS voted to NOT have a waiting period, so the following clause was deleted.** ~~Most of us recommend that a Peer Review Process could only be initiated once every 5 years (e.g., if the PRC does not concur with the negative departmental evaluation, there must be a waiting period before another formal negative MYAR could trigger the PTR process).~~
9. **Require a warning letter one year before a formal negative MYAR can be issued.**
 - **At the meeting on January 12, FS voted to require the department to issue a warning letter one year before the negative MYAR decision could be issued.**
 - ~~We recommend that no formal warning be required, but rather assume that annual MYARs will highlight areas of concern and signal that a formally negative review could be coming~~
10. **Provide option for an individual faculty member to request formation of a Peer Review Committee (outside of the ‘triggered’ MYAR process)?**
 - A faculty member can request a Peer Review Committee to be formed & a full peer review of performance to be completed once every five years
11. **What does the Peer Review Committee do after it is invoked?**
 - The PRC will make an independent review of the performance of the faculty member using a 5-year window.
 - The PRC review will produce a decision about whether the faculty member meets the basic standard for PTR outlined above.
 - The PRC review should provide substantive justification for their decision.
12. **What materials can the PRC review?**
 - The PRC should receive the materials submitted for the department’s MYAR process.
 - The PRC should receive a letter from the department outlining the reasons behind the formally negative MYAR decision (which triggered the review).
 - The faculty member involved should be allowed to write a response to the department’s letter for consideration by the PRC.
13. **What process can trigger the development of a Professional Development Plan (as outlined in code section 405.12.3)?**
 - A negative finding by the Peer Review Committee should be the only mechanism by which a formal Professional Development Plan (PDP) be initiated. This means a department head would not be able to request a PDP unless he or she determined from a MYAR that the faculty member was not discharging their duties conscientiously or with professional competence. The PRC would review that determination before the PDP would be initiated.
 - The PRC should be involved (with the faculty member and department head) in the development and approval of a PDP

OTHER BACKGROUND:

Two other important issues came up in the course of conversations that might be important for the senate to discuss (but which are not exclusively tied to the PTR issue):

14. Ensuring that peer review committees (for P&T and PTR) are qualified and capable of evaluating teaching-centered portfolios

15. Reminding departments that they are responsible (according to our code) for developing their own process for implementing the annual reviews in their unit (and may want to explore ways to bring more peers into the reviews and decisions)

Consistency with Regents' Policy

In addition to the mechanics of an alternative PTR process, we discussed what constraints might be imposed on our options that are associated with Board of Regents or Accreditation Organization policies. Specifically, a number of faculty had questioned whether we could initiate a policy that did not include a formal peer committee review of each post-tenure faculty member at least every 5 years.

Our committee reviewed published policies, and consulted with the USU Provost's office and Office of Analysis, Assessment and Accreditation. Key sections of the Board of Regents' policy and Northwest Commission on Colleges and University (NWCCU) standards are reproduced on the next page. Based on our evaluation and discussion, **we believe that a policy that involves rigorous annual (multi-year window) departmental reviews of post-tenure faculty combined with a triggered intensive peer review committee process meets the basic requirements of both Board of Regents and Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).**

Specifically, our reading of these policies suggests the following conclusions:

- The Regents' policies are fairly open, and only ask that each institution develop policies and processes for:
 - Doing an annual review of faculty competence
 - Administering a review of the work of each tenured faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with accreditation standards
- The NWCCU policies require:
 - Regular evaluation of each faculty member (in general)
 - All faculty need to be evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within every five-year period of service.

None of these policies require a peer evaluation (like the quinquennial committee or proposed Peer Review Committee) every 5 years – just a regular, systematic, substantive evaluation done in a collegial manner. It is our view that the proposed policies would rely on the multi-year annual review to serve as the foundation for both annual and post-tenure reviews, and that the triggered Peer Review Committee would provide a check and balance for addressing situations where the MYAR identified potentially serious issues with faculty performance. These views are shared by our current Provost and the director of USU's AAA office. In particular, it has been their experience that the Board of Regents provides considerable latitude to institutions to develop appropriate policies and procedures.

Bottom line – the working group feels that there is a reasonable expectation that the proposed changes are consistent with Regent's and NWCCU policies, and the faculty can focus their attention on what type of PTR system they want (the status quo or some alternative).

Utah Board of Regents Policies <http://higheredutah.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/R481.pdf>

3.14. Annual Review as Part of Assessing Faculty Competence and, if Funding Permits, Merit Pay Award: Each tenure-track and tenured faculty member, along with all other faculty members, shall be reviewed each year in conjunction with institutional policies on faculty competence. When funding permits, a faculty member may be awarded merit pay consistent with institutional policies and process.

3.15. In-Depth Post-Tenure Review.

3.15.1. Intent of Post-Tenure Review: The review shall assess the tenured faculty member's performance with the intent of:

3.15.1.1. recognizing performance in the discipline's endeavors which demonstrates growth and development;

3.15.1.2. communicating to the faculty member specific areas in need of improvement related to performance in scholarship, teaching, and service, and

3.15.1.3. enhancing each individual's future productivity.

3.15.2 Procedures. The institution shall **establish procedures to administer a review of the work of each tenured faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with accreditation standards.** The criteria for such review shall include multiple indices, and be discipline- and role-specific, as appropriate, to evaluate:

3.15.2.1. teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment.

3.15.2.2. the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity.

3.15.2.3. service to the profession, school and community.

NWCCU Policies

Eligibility Requirements #10. FACULTY: Consistent with its mission and core themes, **the institution employs and regularly evaluates the performance of appropriately qualified faculty** sufficient in number to achieve its educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever offered and however delivered.

Accreditation standards:

- 2.B.3 The institution provides faculty, staff, administrators, and other employees with appropriate opportunities and support for professional growth and development to enhance their effectiveness in fulfilling their roles, duties, and responsibilities.
- 2.B.6 **All faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within every five-year period of service.** The evaluation process specifies the timeline and criteria by which faculty are evaluated; utilizes multiple indices of effectiveness, each of which is directly related to the faculty member's roles and responsibilities, including evidence of teaching effectiveness for faculty with teaching responsibilities; contains a provision to address concerns that may emerge between regularly scheduled evaluations; and provides for administrative access to all primary evaluation data. Where areas for improvement are identified, the institution works with the faculty member to develop and implement a plan to address identified areas of concern.

Report from the Educational Policies Committee January 15, 2015

The Educational Policies Committee met on January 8, 2015. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page¹ and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the January meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of January 8, 2015 which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 49 requests for course actions.
 - A request from the School of Applied Sciences, Technology and Education to restructure the Agricultural Systems Technology MS degree was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Engineering Education to discontinue the Associates of Pre-Engineering (APE) degree at the Regional and USU Eastern campuses.
2. Approval of the report from Academics Standards Subcommittee meeting of December 11, 2014. The action item from that meeting was:
 - International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) Awarding of Credit Policy. A motion to change policy language with respect to the IBO was approved. The new policy language is:

International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) Awarding of Credit Policy:

USU recognizes the International Baccalaureate program. Students who enter USU with International Baccalaureate credits are encouraged to apply to the Honors Program. Students who present an International Baccalaureate diploma will be awarded no more than the number of credits earned with a maximum of 30 credits. These credits will waive the appropriate Breadth and Communications Literacy requirements, but students will still be required to complete the Quantitative Literacy requirement, unless individual scores on IB exams waive those requirements. Each student's transcript will be evaluated individually, based on the courses completed. Students who have not completed the International Baccalaureate diploma may receive up to 8 credits for scores of 5 to 7 on higher-level exams (as shown below), up to a maximum of 30 credits. Individual departments and/or colleges may specify the exact courses necessary to fulfill program requirements. Please note that more than the minimum General Education requirements may be necessary. For instance, some departments and colleges require specific coursework for General Education, and the IBO exams may not satisfy these requirements, in which case additional courses may be required. If, prior to (or after) taking an IBO examination, a student receives credit (including AP credit) for any coursework equivalent to the subject matter of an IBO examination, the IBO credits equivalent to the

course will be deducted. USU recognizes that other institutions have policies differing from those of USU and that those institutions may evaluate the IBO transcript differently than USU. For this reason, please note that transfer students with IBO credits posted to another institution's transcript, but who have less than an associate degree, will have their IBO credits reevaluated based on USU's standards.

3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of November 18, 2014.
Of note:

- The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:
 - MATH 2010 (QI)
 - MATH 2020 (QI)
 - PHIL 4300 (DHA, Charlie Huenemann)
 - RELS/HIST 3020 (DHA, Ravi Gupta)
- Fifteen Year Old General Education Course Policy Change. A motion to revise policy language regarding General Education courses older than 15 years was approved. The new language is:

*Courses taken to satisfy specific General Education (or University Studies) requirements will be deemed as acceptable for satisfying that requirement without review for a maximum of 15 years from the time the course was completed. Students who have not completed the baccalaureate requirements within 15 years after taking General Education (or University Studies) courses must have their courses evaluated and approved by their department head or dean and **the Provost's Office or a designee** in order for the courses to satisfy current General Education (or University Studies) requirements.*

4. Other Business

- A motion to approve a proposal from the Honors Program to create a "Global Engagement Scholar" transcript designation was approved. The proposal is:

PROPOSAL from the University Honors Program (Kristine Miller, director): *to create a new "Global Engagement Scholar" transcript designation*

DESCRIPTION: The University Honors Program proposes to offer its students the opportunity to ground their Honors work in topics of global concern. Focusing on both academic understanding and practical application, Global Engagement Scholars would be students who have learned to think deeply and to engage thoughtfully with the international issues that shape their disciplines. The resulting transcript designation of "Global Engagement Scholar" will communicate to future employers and/or graduate programs the student's commitment to international communication and understanding.

PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS (and alignment with existing requirements for Honors):

Foreign language competence: Students will need to complete two years of course work (or equivalent competency testing) in a second language.

Not a current Honors requirement, but many Honors students choose to complete this work.

9 credits/points of Study Abroad and other Practical Application Work: All

Global Engagement Scholars will complete six credits (or two contracts for six Honors points) of course and/or internship work during at least one term abroad (fall, spring, or summer). Students earn the additional three credits/points in Honors Practical Application work by completing a contract that explores and produces work on a specific topic of global concern.

Honors students are required to complete 9 credits of "practical application" work, which may include various types of academic work beyond the classroom; this requirement focuses that work on topics of global concern and study abroad.

Returning Traveler Presentation: The semester of their return from study- abroad, Global Engagement Scholars will present to the Honors community a 30-minute PowerPoint presentation outlining a specific international issue that informed their study abroad and articulating how that issue has extended and shaped their academic study here at USU.

Honors students must have a final product for any practical application work; this requirement advertises the program and creates a venue for their final products.

Honors Capstone/Thesis: The final capstone or thesis project will need to demonstrate substantial engagement with global issues in the student's discipline. Like other Honors students, Global Engagement Scholars will enroll in a one-credit thesis proposal course before completing the thesis. The faculty mentor, any committee members, departmental Honors advisor, and Honors program director must approve not only the thesis proposal itself but also its Global Engagement emphasis.

Honors students must all complete a thesis or capstone project; once again, this transcript designation would focus that work on global issues

Proposed change #1 to the USU Policy (stemming from AFT committee jurisdiction):

State that a non-renewal notice must disclose the reason for non-renewal, but elaboration is at the president's discretion.

Reason for change:

There are only three allowable reasons for the non-renewal of tenure-eligible or term appointment faculty (Policy 407.6.2): unsatisfactory performance of assigned role, failure to meet tenure requirements (only applicable in final tenure decision year), and cessation of extramural funding required for salary support. The same Policy section also states that these faculty members may not be non-renewed for reasons that violate their academic freedom. A recent grievant to the AFT committee pointed out that no reason was included in their notice of non-renewal (although previous reviews of the faculty member had indicated concerns). Policy 407.6.4 says that the notice of non-renewal may state the reasons for non-renewal, at the president's discretion. It seems only fair to disclose to a non-renewed faculty member the reason(s) for non-renewal (of the three allowed by code) in the formal written notice. Such disclosure would also strengthen the protection of academic freedom, and non-renewed faculty members would not be left to wonder whether their academic freedom was an issue. This can be achieved without any additional burden on the president (who writes or approves the formal notice of non-renewal), as the proposed change would only require the written notice to identify one (or more) of the three allowable reasons, with the president retaining the option to elaborate. The AFT committee opposes requiring such elaboration, however, as that could be an unnecessary duplication of previous reports or reviews of the faculty member. Stating the reason (of the three allowed) for non-renewal in the written notice is not redundant since that is where the final *decision* (as opposed to *recommendations* from the tenure advisory committee, department head, or dean) is communicated to the faculty member (Policy 407.6.3).

Current USU Policy 407.6.4(1):

"Reasons for non-renewal may be stated in the notice of non-renewal, at the president's discretion."

Proposed USU Policy 407.6.4(1):

"**The reason(s) for non-renewal (of the three specified in 407.6.2) ~~may~~ shall be stated in the notice of non-renewal. At the president's discretion, the notice may elaborate on the reason(s) by referencing previous reports or reviews of the faculty member (405.7, 405.12.1).**"

Proposed change #2 to the USU Policy (stemming from AFT committee jurisdiction):

Fix a typographical error.

Reason for change:

Unnecessary word should be removed.

Current USU Policy 407.6.2:

“... Tenure-eligible and term appointment faculty members may not have their appointments non-renewed for reasons which that violate their academic freedom or legal rights.”

Proposed USU Policy 407.6.2:

“... Tenure-eligible and term appointment faculty members may not have their appointments non-renewed for reasons ~~which~~ that violate their academic freedom or legal rights.”

Proposed change #3 to the USU Policy (stemming from AFT committee jurisdiction):

Fix a typographical error.

Reason for change:

Policy 407.6.6(8) does not exist, but Policy 407.5.6(8) refers to the scope of the recommendation of the AFT hearing panel.

Current USU Policy 402.12.3(1)(b):

“Hearing panels of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee shall, when hearing grievances, determine whether procedural due process was granted the petitioner as provided in this policy and determine whether the grievance is valid or not valid (see policy 407.6.6(8)) The recommendation of the hearing panel shall be binding on the general membership of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.”

Proposed USU Policy 402.12.3(1)(b):

“Hearing panels of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee shall, when hearing grievances, determine whether procedural due process was granted the petitioner as provided in this policy and determine whether the grievance is valid or not valid (see policy 407.65.6(8)). The recommendation of the hearing panel shall be binding on the general membership of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.”

Proposed changes to 405 policy (initiated by Provost Cockett; reviewed & amended by AFT committee)

CHANGE 1

- Clarify that the role statement should be approved by the Provost but the Provost's signature is not needed.

Reason for change:

Currently, the draft role statement is approved by the Provost before an offer is extended to a new faculty member and the Provost's signature is obtained after the faculty member, department head and dean(s), Vice President for Extension and/or chancellor have signed. However, the routing of the role statement back to the Provost can delay processing the hiring EPAF and seems unnecessary because the Provost has already approved the document.

Current USU Policy (405.6.1):

A role statement will be prepared by the department head or supervisor, agreed upon between the department head or supervisor and the faculty member at the time he or she accepts an appointment, and approved by the academic dean and the provost and where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional domains (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative evaluation weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional domains.

Proposed USU Policy:

A role statement will be prepared by the department head or supervisor, and agreed upon between the department head or supervisor and the faculty member at the time he or she accepts an appointment, as indicated by their signatures. The role statement should also be, ~~and~~ approved by the academic dean and the provost and where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean, prior to the faculty member's signature, and then signed by the academic dean, and the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean where applicable. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional domains (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative evaluation weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional domains.

CHANGE 2

- Allow for an annual work plan for faculty located on the RC and Eastern campuses.

Reason for change:

Faculty at the regional campuses and USU-Eastern teach classes in a variety of delivery methods including face-to-face, broadcast, online and blended. Significant planning is required to appropriately schedule and deliver classes across the regional and Eastern campuses. A signed annual work plan would facilitate class scheduling and also keep the department head at the Logan campus “in the loop” on course assignments and planned research activities for each RC and Eastern faculty member. The annual work plan would be initiated by the department head in consultation with the RC dean, and approved by the department head and RC dean.

Current USU Policy (405.6.1):

Some academic units may find it useful to employ an annual work plan or “role assignment”. The faculty member's role assignment provides for the detailed implementation of the professional domains of the faculty member described in the role statement. During the annual review, the role assignment may be adjusted within the parameters of the role statement. Major changes in the role assignment may prompt review and revision of the role statement.

Proposed USU Policy:

Some academic units, such as Extension and the Regional and Eastern campuses, may find it useful to employ an annual work plan or “role assignment”. The faculty member's role assignment provides for the detailed implementation of the professional domains of the faculty member described in the role statement. During the annual review, the role assignment may be adjusted within the parameters of the role statement. Major changes in the role assignment may prompt review and revision of the role statement.

CHANGE 3: The annual P&T letter generated by the department head should not be used as the annual review letter for tenure-eligible faculty.

Reason for the change: The standards for promotion and tenure are different than the standards for the annual review.

Current USU Policy (405.12.1):

Each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty shall be reviewed annually. Such reviews shall, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean.

The annual evaluation and recommendation by the department head or supervisor for tenure-eligible faculty (405.7.1 (3)) may constitute this review for salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

Original Proposed USU Policy:

The annual evaluation and recommendation letter by the department head or supervisor developed for tenure-eligible faculty as part of the promotion and tenure process (405.7.1 (3)) may not serve as a substitute for this annual review letter for salary adjustment.

CHANGE 4

- Joint letter from the academic and regional campus (RC) deans or chancellor should be allowed during the evaluation and recommendation in the promotion and tenure process.

Reason for the change: The USU Policy currently requires separate letters from the regional campus dean or chancellor. However, a single letter from the academic dean and the RC dean or chancellor can effectively convey the recommendation and needed information during the tenure and/or promotion process.

Current USU Policy [405.7.2(4); 405.8.3(4); 405.11.4(4)]:

405.7.2(4): Tenure

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's recommendation, and the tenure advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11, except that for third-year appointees the date is November 20. The regional campus dean will also submit a separate recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-CEU will submit a separate recommendation for each USU-CEU candidate. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the tenure advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.8.3(4): Promotion

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a separate recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-CEU will submit a separate recommendation for each USU-CEU candidate. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.11.4(4): Term appointments

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a separate recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-CEU will submit a separate recommendation for each USU-CEU candidate. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

Proposed USU Policy:

405.7.2(4): Tenure

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's recommendation, and the tenure advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11, except that for third-year appointees the date is November 20.

The regional campus dean will also submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-CEU will submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each USU-CEU candidate. ~~or~~ These recommendations may be submitted jointly with the academic dean's recommendation. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the tenure advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.8.3(4): Promotion

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-CEU will submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each USU-CEU candidate. ~~T~~ or these recommendations may be submitted jointly with the academic dean's recommendation. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.11.4(4): Term appointments

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-CEU will submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each USU-CEU candidate. ~~T~~ or these recommendations may be submitted jointly with the academic dean's recommendation. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.2 TENURE AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA FOR CORE FACULTY RANKS

2.2 Criteria for the Award of Tenure and for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor are awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her responsibilities as defined by the role statement. Although tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members are expected to carry out the major university functions of teaching, research or creative endeavors, extension, and service, individual emphasis will vary within and among academic departments as described in each faculty member's role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which he or she performs, and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement. The criteria for the award of tenure and the criteria for the award of promotion from assistant to associate professor are the same. These criteria include, but are not limited to: an established reputation based upon a balance of teaching, research or creative endeavors, extension, and service; broad recognition of professional success in the field of appointment; evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which the faculty member performs; and evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement (policies 401.3.2(3) and 405.2.1). Excellence is measured by standards for associate professors within the national professional peer group.

The foregoing criteria are to be applied to the following areas:

(1) Teaching.

Teaching includes but is not limited to all forms of instructional activities: classroom performance, broadcast and online instruction, mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, student advising and supervision, thesis and dissertation direction, and curriculum development. Documentation supporting teaching performance must include student and peer evaluations, and may include, but is not restricted to: proficiency in curriculum development as demonstrated through imaginative or creative use of instructional materials such as syllabi, instructional manuals, edited readings, case studies, media packages and computer programs; authorship of textbooks; teaching and/or advising awards; authorship of refereed articles on teaching; success of students in post-graduate endeavors; evidence of mentoring inside and outside the classroom, including work with graduate or undergraduate researchers, graduate instructors or undergraduate teaching fellows, applicants for major scholarships or grants, and Honors or other independent study work; recognition by peers of substantive contributions on graduate committees; service on professional committees, panels, and task forces; and invited lectures or panel participation.

405.5 TENURE AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FACULTY RANKS

5.2 Criteria for the Award of Tenure and for Promotion from Professional Career and Technical Education Assistant Professor to Professional Career and Technical Education Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion from professional career and technical education assistant professor to professional career and technical education associate professor are awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her assignment. Although professional career and technical education faculty are expected to carry out the major university functions of teaching, research or creative endeavors, and service responsibilities assigned to them, individual emphasis will vary as described in the faculty member's role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which he or she performs and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement.

The criteria for the award of tenure and for promotion from professional career and technical education assistant professor to professional career and technical education associate professor are the same. These criteria include, but are not limited to: all of the qualifications prescribed for an professional career and technical education assistant professor; a bachelor's degree from an accredited university; a minimum of seven years of full-time teaching at an accredited college; an established reputation based upon a balance of teaching, research or creative endeavors, and service; broad recognition for professional success in the field of appointment; evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which the faculty member performs; and evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement. Excellence is measured by national standards within the professional peer group.

The foregoing criteria are to be applied to the following areas:

(1) Teaching.

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, all forms of career and technical education instructional activities: classroom performance, student advising and supervision, ~~oversight of independent learning~~ mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, and curriculum development. Documentation supporting teaching performance must include student and peer evaluations, and may include, but is not restricted to: proficiency in identifying the needs of the identified audience; curriculum development as demonstrated through imaginative or creative use of up-to-date instructional methods materials such as workshops, conferences, classes, lectures, newsletters, syllabi, instructional manuals, assigned readings, case studies, media presentations, packages and computer-assisted instruction, programs; authorship of extension bulletins, self-instruction textbooks or other instructional materials; program development teaching and/or advising awards; authorship of refereed articles on teaching; evidence of mentoring inside and outside the classroom, including work with graduate or undergraduate researchers, graduate instructors or undergraduate teaching fellows.

applicants for major scholarships or grants, and Honors or other independent study work; success of students in post-instructional licensing procedures or employment placements; service on professional committees; panels and task forces; and invited presentations or panel participation and professional lectures or consultations.

405.10 TERM APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA

10.1 Criteria for Promotion to the Penultimate Ranks:

Clinical or Research Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor (Federal Cooperator), Assistant Professor (Federal Research), Lecturer, Professional Practice Instructor to Clinical or Research Associate Professor, Associate Professor (Federal Cooperator), Associate Professor (Federal Research), Senior Lecturer, and Professional Practice Associate Professor

Promotion to the penultimate ranks is awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which he or she performs and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement.

For promotion to the penultimate ranks, faculty members must demonstrate their ability to fulfill the following criteria, appropriate to their appointment:

(1) Teaching.

Teaching includes all forms of instructional activities: classroom performance, mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, student advising, clinical supervision, thesis and dissertation direction, and curriculum development. Evidence supporting teaching performance must include student and peer evaluations where appropriate, and may include, but is not restricted to: proficiency in curriculum development as demonstrated through imaginative or creative use of up-to-date instructional materials such as syllabi, instructional manuals, edited readings, case studies, media packages, and computer programs; authorship of textbooks; teaching and/or advising awards; authorship of refereed articles on teaching; success of students in post-graduate endeavors; evidence of mentoring inside and outside the classroom, including work with graduate or undergraduate researchers, graduate instructors or undergraduate teaching fellows, applicants for major scholarships or grants, and Honors or other independent study work; recognition by peers of substantive contributions on graduate committees; service on professional committees, panels, and task forces; invited lectures or panel participation.